IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PIUS C.KURIAKOSE

FRIDAY, THE 14TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 23RD BHADRA 1929

CRP.No. 1188 of 2001()

AGAINST THE ORDER DATED 05/04/2001 IN E.A.300/2000 IN EP.18/2000 IN OS.599/94 of MUNSIFF COURT, PARAVUR

.....

REVN. PETITIONERS:JUDGMENT DEBTORS: DEFENDANTS 1 TO 6:

---

1. SEETHA, W/O.KRISHNAN ACHARI,
   MELADATHU VEETIL, KOTTAPPURAM KARA,
   ALANGADU VILLAGE.
2. VENU, S/O.KRISHNAN ACHARI, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.
3. MOHANAN, S/O.KRISHNAN ACHARI, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.
4. CHANDRAN, S/O.KRISHNAN ACHARI, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.
5. VIJAYAN, S/O.KRISHNAN ACHARI, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.
6. RAJI, D/O.KRISHNAN ACHARI, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.

BY ADV. SRI.P.K.MEETHIAN KUNJU

RESPONDENTS:DECREE HOLDERS/PLAINTIFFS 1 TO 6:

---

1. PANKAJAKSHY AMMA, D/O.PARUKUTTY AMMA, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.
2. GOVINDAN, S/O.PANKAJAKSHY AMMA, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.
3. VIJAYAN, S/O.PARUKUTTY AMMA, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.

4. VIJAYALAKSHMI, D/O.PARUKUTTY AMMA,
   MELADATHU VEETIL, KOTTAPPURAM KARA,
   ALANGADU VILLAGE.

5. RAJALAKSHMI, D/O.PARUKUTTY AMMA,
   MELADATHU VEETIL, KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.

6. GIRIJA, D/O.PARUKUTTY AMMA, MELADATHU VEETIL,
   KOTTAPPURAM KARA, ALANGADU VILLAGE.

THIS CIVIL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 14/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER ON CMP NO.2772 OF 2001 IN C.R.P.NO.1188 OF 2001

DISMISSED.

14.9.2007 SD/- PIUS C.KURIAKOSE, JUDGE.

PIUS C. KURIAKOSE,J.

- -

C.R.P. No.1188 of 2001

- -

Dated: 14th September, 2007

ORDER

This C.R.P. is remaining defective since 2001 on the reason that service is not completed on the respondents. Under the impugned order, the petitioners prayer for stay of the execution proceedings was declined on the reason that the appellate court had not granted stay. I do not find any infirmity about the view of the learned Munsiff. Today there is no representation for the petitioners. In all probability, the appeal is finally disposed of and the C.R.P. has become infructuous. However, in the absence of the counsel for the petitioners, the C.R.P. will stand dismissed only for default.

srd **PIUS C.KURIAKOSE, JUDGE**